

interested parties is considered, public comment is requested, and the National Park Service will consider all comments received and make appropriate amendments if public comments so warrant.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before September 6, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be directed to Robert K. Yearout, Chief, Concessions Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, D.C. 20013-7127.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Laurie Shaffer, Contract Analyst, Contract Branch, Concessions Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, D.C. 20013-7127. Copies of the proposed guidelines are available on request.

**Roger G. Kennedy,**  
*Director.*

[FR Doc. 95-19309 Filed 8-4-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

## INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

[Finance Docket No. 32433]

### Chicago and North Western Transportation Company—Construction and Operation Exemption—City of Superior, Douglas County, WI

**AGENCY:** Interstate Commerce Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of exemption.

**SUMMARY:** Under 49 U.S.C. 10505, the Commission exempts from the prior approval requirements of 49 U.S.C. 10901 Chicago and North Western Railway Company's (CNW) construction and operation of a 2,900-foot line of railroad, subject to conditions to mitigate environmental effects. The proposed line, located in the City of Superior, Douglas County, WI, will connect CNW's Superior rail yard to a transloading coal dock owned by Midwest Energy Resources Company on Lake Superior. By decision served May 11, 1994 (published May 12, 1994, at 59 FR 24710), the Commission conditionally exempted only construction of the line, subject to completion of environmental review and a further decision. The environmental analysis is now completed.

**DATES:** This exemption is effective on August 7, 1995, subject to the condition that CNW comply with the environmental mitigation measures adopted in the decision regarding

construction and operation of the involved rail line. Petitions to reopen must be filed by August 28, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Send pleadings referring to Finance Docket No. 32433 to: (1) Office of the Secretary, Case Control Branch, Interstate Commerce Commission, 1201 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20423; and (2) Petitioner's representative: Stuart F. Gassner, One North Western Center, Chicago, IL 60606.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Joseph H. Dettmar, (202) 927-5660. (TDD for the hearing impaired: (202) 927-5721.)

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Additional information is contained in the Commission's decision. To obtain a copy of the full decision, write to, call, or pick up in person from: Dynamic Concepts, Inc., Interstate Commerce Commission Building, 1201 Constitution Avenue NW., Room 2229, Washington, DC 20423. Telephone: (202) 289-4537/4359. (Assistance for the hearing impaired is available through TDD services (202) 927-5721.)

Decided: July 24, 1995.

By the Commission, Chairman Morgan, Vice Chairman Owen, and Commissioners Simmons and McDonald.

**Vernon A. Williams,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 95-19368 Filed 8-4-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7035-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Antitrust Division

#### United States v. Interstate Bakeries Corp. and Continental Baking Co.; Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)-(h), that a proposed Final Consent Judgment, Stipulation, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division in a civil antitrust case, *United States v. Interstate Bakeries Corp. and Continental Baking Co.*, Civ. No. 95 C 4194.

On July 20, 1995, the United States filed a Complaint seeking to enjoin a transaction by which Interstate agreed to acquire Continental. Continental and Interstate are the country's first and third largest wholesale commercial bakers and producers of white pan bread ("plain old white bread"). The Complaint alleged that the proposed acquisition would substantially lessen

competition in the sale of white pan bread in five markets (Chicago, Milwaukee, central Illinois (Springfield, Peoria, Champaign/Urbana), San Diego, and Los Angeles) in violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18.

The proposed Final Judgment requires defendants to divest such brand names and possibly other assets as are necessary to create a new competitor in the sale of white pan bread in each of the five markets. If the required divestitures are not accomplished within nine months, the Court will appoint a trustee to complete the sales. The Hold Separate Stipulation and Order is intended to facilitate the divestitures by requiring defendants to hold separate and maintain certain products and plans as economically viable assets pending possible divestiture. A Competitive Impact Statement filed by the United States describes the Complaint, the proposed Final Judgment, and remedies available to private litigants.

The public is invited to comment to the Justice Department and to the Court. Comments should be addressed to Anthony V. Nanni, Chief, Litigation I Section, U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 1401 H Street NW., Room 4000, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: (202) 307-0207). Comments must be received within sixty days.

Copies of the Complaint, Hold Separate Stipulation and Order, proposed Final Judgment, and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection in Room 207 of the U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, 325 7th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: (202) 514-2841), and at the office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, 219 S. Dearborn, 20th Floor, Chicago, Illinois, 60604. Copies of these materials may be obtained upon request and payment of a copying fee.

**Constance K. Robinson,**

*Director of Operations.*

Civil Action No.: 95C 4194

Filed: 7/20/95

Judge Manning

#### Hold Separate Stipulation and Order

It is hereby stipulated and agreed by and between the undersigned parties, subject to approval and entry by the Court, that:

#### I. Definitions

As used in this Stipulation and Order:

A. "Associated Assets" means:

(1) All labels used on White Pan Bread in the Relevant Territories;